UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/632,518	08/02/2003	Jared Green	13768.783.92	4345

47973 7590 05/01/2007		EXAMINER
WORKMAN NYDEGGER/MICROSOFT		TRUONG, LECHI
1000 EAGLE GATE TOWER	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE	2194	
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111		

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/632,518	GREEN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2194	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 April 2007</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-44 and 46-51* is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1, 3-44, 46-51* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

       1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1, 3-44, 46-51 are presented for the examination. Claims 2, 45 are canceled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   Claims 22, 40-44, 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to

comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter, which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the

relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the

claimed invention.

As to claims 22, 41, the claims contain subject matter " recordable-type" which was not

described in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims **1, 23, 40, 45** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in

view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475).

As to claim 1, Dawson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a

configuration request (received event is received directly from a client; generating a server-to-

server event message for said received event, col 9, ln 18-21/a sever-to-server event message 50,

col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator 53 responds to one of the received client or

server events for which the coupled server 17 is a receiver by generating a server-to-server event

massage 50, col 5, ln 64-67/ the logging event message generator generates a server-to server

event message in response to the request from the client), indicating(source trail of received

message, col 9, ln 45-50/ A server –to –server event message is generated for the received event,

the message including: … a source trail indicating, col 2, ln 24-28/ the event message is

transmitted to the receiving server only if the receiver server identifier is absent from the parsed

source trail, col 2, ln 40-43), a set of one or more receivers(the ones of receivers 12, 30, 32, 34,

36, 37, 38, col 5, ln 57-59), receiving a configuration request, the configuration request

indicating a selection of a set of one or more logging software object(col 5, ln 47-59/ col 8, ln

45-48/ ln 62-65/col 9, ln 45-50), instantiating the set of one or more logging software objects

according to the received configuration request(col 4, ln 22-29/col5, ln 47-59) and publishing

the message to the set of one or more logging software objects define in the configuration

request(col 8, ln 45-48/ ln 62-65/col 9, ln 45-50/ col 5, ln 47-59), a trace object(the event

message 50, col 5, ln 50-55/ col 6, ln 1-5), a trace object in a uniform format that is utilized by

the logging software object(the event message 50 includes . . a fully constructed text message

63, preferably in the primary text language [uniform format]of the server 10, col 6, ln 1-6/ the

receiving server has a listing of events by event identifier and corresponding text messages in the

primary text language of the receiving server… the receiving server logs the received server-to-

server event, employing the identified text message in the listing in the text language of the

receiving server, col 2, ln 50-60).

Dawson does not explicitly teach software object separate from the application being

tested that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a format different that the format used

by the application being tested, receiving request to log message from the application being

tested. However, Pankovein teaches software object separate from the application being tested

that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a format different that the format used by the

application being tested, receiving request to log message from the application being tested (the

client 132 executes a software test, and produces a test log that is stored as a file on the client'

hard drive. It is assumed for the purpose of this example that the test log is in format#2. At step

202, the client calls the Openfile function via the interface 148, and passed the location of the file

and the file type to the parsing engine 126. The parsing engine 126 then loads the plug-in module

122 at the step 202. At the step 202, the parsing engine 126 calls the ParseLogResuts function of

plug-in module 122 via interface 142, and sends the location of the log file as part of the

logHandle parameter. At step 202, the plug-in module 122 parses the data in the log file and

converts the results from their original format and categories into a simple tally... the parsing

engine returns the results to the client 132 in standard format, col 6, ln 42-62/ col 5, ln 35-42).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson to incorporate the feature of software object

separate from the application being tested that are to be instantiated for logging messages in a

format different that the format used by the application being tested, receiving request to log

message from the application being tested because this allows the data in the standard format

from the records to be stored in a database.

Dawson and Pankovein do not teach the selection having been dynamically entered by a

computer user. However, Godbole teaches the selection having been dynamically entered by a

computer user (the user input 16 allows the user to determine the various transforms that are

applied to the raw data, col 3, ln 41-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson and Pankovein to incorporate the feature of the

selection having been dynamically entered by a computer user because this allows user the

ability to automatically apply the data flow to the corrected transformations.

As to claim 23, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Pankovein teaches a logger having an interface

configured to received a configuration request to log (col 6, ln 45-48), a local publisher

configured to receive a log message form the logger (col 6, ln 45-55) and Dawson teaches a set

of one or more devices configured to log messages (various receivers are typically provided to

receive certain of the events... example of receivers which are part of the server subsystem

include server console 12, ... database, col 4, ln 28-35), the set selectable at run time (the

logging distributor 54 examines the parsed source trail 62 of step 114 for the identifier of the

coupled receiving server 18, col 45-50/ Fig. 1).

As to claim 40, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Dawson teaches registering each device in the set with a

publisher (col 1, ln 62-67/ col 2, ln 35-42).

As to claim 45, it is an apparatus claim of claim 2; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 2 above.

4.   Claims **3, 46** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1).

As to claim 3, Dawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach the trace object is formatted in accordance with an extensible markup language (XML). However, Elmore teaches the trace object is formatted in accordance with an extensible markup language (XML)(logging service maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to determine whether to log a message, right col 134, ln 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Elmore because Elmore's an extensible markup language (XML) would improve the efficiency of Dawson and Pankovein and Godbole's systems by providing a messages contain identifiers for the security of log event.

As to claim 46, it is an apparatus claim of claim 3; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 3 above.

5.   Claims **4, 5, 9, 43, 51** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in

view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Austen

et al (US 6,842870 B2).

As to claim 4, Dawson, Pandovein and Godbole not teach each device is associated with

an indication of the types of message logged. However, Austen teaches each device is associated

with an indication of the types of messages logged (identifying an error type for the error log,

responsive to an identification that the error log is a regional error log, identifying each partition

to receive the error log, col 7, ln 24-30).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Austen because Austen's

each device is associated with an indication of the types of messages logged would improve the

efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole's systems by providing an improved instruction of

computer for handling particular errors log to corresponding logically partitioned data processing

system.

As to claim 5, Dawson teaches publishing the message further comprises sending a

pointer to each device that logs messages of a type associated with the message, the pointer

pointing to memory that includes the trace object (col 9, ln 18-25).

As to claim 9, Austen teaches an environment variable (col 4, ln 32-37).

As to claim 43, it is an apparatus claim of claim 9; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 9 above.

As to claim 51, Austen teaches indicating what type of message or types of message to publish to the device (col 5, ln 29-37).

6.   Claims **6-8, 41-42** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1).

As to claim 6, Dawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Josyula because Josyula's a command line parameter would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole's systems by allowing a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

As to claim 7, Dawson teaches database (col 4, ln 32-35) and Josyula teaches the command line parameter indicates that the set of devices to which to log messages is in a database (Para [0040], ln 3-12).

As to claim 8, Dawson teaches a registry (col1, ln 62-67).

As to claims 41, 42, they are apparatus claims of claims 6, 7; therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 6, 7 above.

7.   Claims **10, 13-14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of

Godbole et al (US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Currey et al

(US 6,769079 B1).

        As to claim 10, Dawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach calling a filter to indicate

that the message is available to be logged. However, Currey teaches calling a filter to indicate

that the message is available to be logged (allowing filtering to determine which log message go

to which of the specified destinations 68, 10, 72, based on a limited type of source information

associated with the process that calls syslog (), col 4, ln 59-65).

        It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Currey because Currey's

calling a filter to indicate that the message is available to be logged would   improve the

efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole's systems by providing a reliable and flexible

logging of error which allows messages to be filtered and forwarded to different destination as

desired.

        As to claim 13, Dawson teaches the message to determine whether to send the message

or data derived from the message to a device (col 6, ln 40-45).

        As to claim 14, Currey teaches the request to log a message comes from a current thread

(col 5, ln 52-55).

8.   Claims **11, 47** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et

al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in view of

Godbole et al (US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769079

B1) and further in view of Chirashnya et al (US. Patent 6,598179 B1).

        As to claim 11, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Currey do not teach the filter is called

through a callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a callback

function (list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32, col 5, ln

23-24).

        It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Currey and Chirashnya

because Chirashnya's the filter is called through a callback function would   improve the

efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Currey's systems by allowing the callback

function script to check each error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria can be

easily modified and added to without recompilation of the system.

        As to claim 47, it is an apparatus claim of claim 11; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 11 above.

9.   Claim **12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al

(US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al

(US 5,768475), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1) and

further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management method).

As to claim 12, Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole and Currey do not teach a notification by the filter that a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole, Currey and Suwaki because Suwaki 's a notification by the filter would   improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovien, Godbole and Currey's systems by reducing the memory capacity necessary for holding the information.

10.   Claims **15-18, 48-49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) and further in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475, as applied to claim 1 above, in view of Currey et al (US 6,769079 B1) and further in view of Maurille (US 6,484,196 B1).

As to claim 15, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Currey do not teach providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread. However, Maurille teaches providing a context identifier that identifies a context of the current thread (threading information (parent and child message ID), col 3, ln 18-23/ thread ID, col 8, ln 31-34).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Currey and Maurille because

Maurille 's the filter is called through a callback function would   improve the efficiency of

Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Currey's systems by allowing the internet with two levels of

threading to transfer information between the nodes smoothly.

As to claim 16, Maurille teaches the context identifier further identifies a context of a

parent thread associated with the current thread (col 3, ln 18-23/ col 8, ln 33-38).

As to claim 17, Maurille teaches   publishing the message comprises providing

information that uniquely identifies the thread (col 9, ln 10-15).

As to claim 18, Maurille teaches the information comprises an identifier that identifies a

machine on which the current thread executes, a name of a process that spawned the current

thread, an identifier that identifies the process, and an identifier that identifies the thread (col 3,

ln 15-25).

As to claims 48, 49, they are apparatus claims of claims 15, 16, 18; therefore, they are

rejected for the same reasons as claims 15, 16, 18 above.

11.   Claims **19-22, 24, 50** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of

Godbole et al (US 5,768475 as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kougiouris et al

(US 2005/0028171 A1).

As to claim 19, Dawson , Pankovein and Godbole do not teach receiving the

configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message has been

compiled, such that the application is not required to be recompiled to publish messages.

However Kougiouries teaches receiving the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message has been compiled (When requesting a client-side logging component to log an event, a module may pass the event mask information to determine whether the event is associated with a category, para [0060], ln 7-12/ If the client sign logging component determines that the event received from the client-side logging component may timestamp the event... creating a data structure representing the event, para[0077], ln 1-8), application is not required to be recompiled to publish messages(the types of events they sent to the centralized event lob, without requiring code to be recompiled, or the event service to be re-started, para[0008], ln 5-8).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris because Kougiouris 's the configuration request occurs after an application that requests to log the message, the application is not required to be recompiled would improve the efficiency of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole's systems avoiding any possible overhead involved in process switching.

As to claim 20, Kougiouris teaches the message is published on a first machine and wherein the request to log the message is received from a second machine (para [0086], ln 4-10/ para [0088], ln 1-6).

As to claim 21, Kougiouris teaches combining a request to log a first message from the first machine with a request to log a second message received from the second machine before publishing the message on the first machine (right col 7, ln 25-29).

As to claim 22, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above.

As to claim 24, Kougiouris teaches a filter configured to receive a notification when the local publisher publishes a message. (para [0093], ln 3-9).

As to claim 50, it is an apparatus claim of claim 20; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 20 above.

12.   Claims **25, 28, 29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2).

As to claim 25, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices. However, Austen teaches the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices (filtering error logs such that only errors that pertain to a particular partition are reported to that partition, col 5, ln 3-7).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris to incorporate the feature of the filter determines whether to forward the message or data derived from the message to one of the devices because this provides an improved instruction of computer for handling error logs in a logically partitioned data processing system.

As to claims 28 and 29, Kougiouris teaches the interface provides access to methods associated with the logger, the interface being customized to operate with a programming language or programming model, wherein the programming model comprises a component object model (COM)(para [0092], ln 6-11).

13.   Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) and further in view Suwaki (Event Report Management method).

As to claim 26, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach a notification by the filter that a test has completed. However, Suwaki teaches a notification by the filter that a test has completed (a filter test to notification and informs a manager of this test contents, page 2, ln 1-3).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris to incorporate the feature of the filter because this provides the memory capacity necessary for reducing holding information needed by the system.

14.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al

(US 5,768475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) and further in view of

Chirashnya et al (US. Patent 6,598179 B1).

As to claim 27, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris do not teach the filter is

called through a callback function. However, Chirashnya teaches the filter is called through a

callback function (list of errors in the filtering table and criteria defined by callback functions 32,

col 5, ln 23-24).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Kougiouris to incorporate

the feature of the filter is called through a callback function because this allows the callback

function script to check each error type for relevance thus the error selection criteria that can be

easily modified and added to without recompilation of the system.

15.   Claims **30-31**   are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson

et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et

al (US 5,768475) as applied to claim 23, and further in view of Mohan (US. Patent 5,418940).

As to claim 30, Drawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach allocates a buffer.

However, Mohan teaches allocates a buffer (allocated a log buffer 20 from main memory for

storage of log records destined for system log 21, col 6, ln 41-44).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Drawson, Pankovein and Godbole to incorporate the feature

of   allocates a buffer   because this allows a buffer to be transmitted out for recording to

minimize the seek and latency delays.

As to claim 31, Mohan teaches allocates memory from the buffer to receive the log

message (col 6, ln 42-44).

16.   Claim **32 is** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al

(US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al

(US 5,768475) as applied to claim 23, and further in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107

A1).

As to claim 32, Dawson teaches trace object (col 2, ln 24-30)

Drawson, Pankovein and Godbole do not teach   log message in an extensible markup

language (XML). However, Elmore teaches log message in an extensible markup language

(XML)(logging service maintains an XML file which specifies a list of value are used to

determine whether to log a message, right col 13, ln 40-43).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Drawson, Pankovein and Godbole to incorporate the feature

of an extensible markup language (XML) because this provides a messages containing

identifiers for the security of log event.

17.   Claims **33-39** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson

et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et

al (US 5,768475) as applied to claim 23, in view of Elmore et al (US 2006/0059107 A1) and

further in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1)

As to claim 33, Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Elmore do not teach an application

configured to request that messages be logged via the logger. However Kougiouris teaches an

application configured to request that messages be logged via the logger (para [0086], ln 5-6).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole and Elmore to incorporate the

feature of a filter configured to receive a notification when the local publisher publishes a

message because this allows clients dynamically alter the types of events they send to the

centralized event log, without requiring code to be recompiled, or the event service to be re-

started

As to claim 34, Kougiouirs teaches   the application operates asynchronously with

respect to the logger (para [0077], ln 8-12).

As to claim 35, Kougiourirs teaches the application continues executing even if there is

insufficient memory to log the message (para [0078], ln 10-15).

As to claim 36, Kougiourirs teaches   the application operates synchronously with respect

to the logger (para [0077], ln 6-8).

As to claim 37, Dawson teaches the set of one or more devices is selected after the

application is compiled (col 5, ln 50-60).

As to claim 38, Kougiourirs teaches each device is configured to transform a received

log message for display, output, storage, or transmission (para [0046], ln 1-12).

As to claim 39, Kougiourirs teaches a reader configured to read a trace comprised of data derived from the log messages and to display the trace in a hierarchical manner (para [0046], ln 1-12).

18.   Claim 44 is   rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over   Dawson et al (US 6,230198) in view of Pankovein et al (US Patent 7,111,075 B2) in view of Godbole et al (US 5,768475) in view of Kougiouris et al (US 2005/0028171 A1) further in view of Austen et al (US 6,842870 B2) and further in view of Josyula et al (US 2004/0028059 A1)

As to claim 44, Austen teaches an environment variable (Operating system 201a-204 a exist, col 4, ln 30-35). Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Austen do not teach a command line parameter. However, Josyula teaches a command line parameter (command line interface (CLI) shells 330, para [0040], ln 11-19/ para [0042], ln 3-12).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Dawson, Pankovein, Godbole, Kougiouris and Austen   to incorporate the feature of a command line parameter because this allows a user can manipulate the network node through the CLI shell.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272 3767. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomson, William can be reached on (571) 272 3718. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

June 11, 2007

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER